



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/046,131

10/21/2001

Francisco M. Galanes

M61.12-0393

9228

27366

7590

07/31/2008

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)

SUITE 1400

900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244

EXAMINER

LERNER, MARTIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/31/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/046,131	Applicant(s) GALANES ET AL.	
	Examiner MARTIN LERNER	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12 to 22 and 52 to 56 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 11 and 23 to 51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/05/2008</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicants' election without traverse of Group II, Claims 23 to 51, in the reply filed on 13 June 2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 12 to 22 and 52 to 56 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 13 June 2008.

Claims 1 to 11 are generic.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 to 11 and 23 to 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Independent claims 1 and 23 are amended to contain the term "modality dependent", which is new matter because Applicants' Specification as originally-filed

does not provide an adequate written description in such a way as to reasonably convey that the inventors had possession of the concept of modality dependence. The Specification does not set forth the term "modality dependent", and the only disclosure of the term is from *Dantzig et al.*, the prior art from which Applicants are attempting to distinguish.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 to 11 and 23 to 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitations of independent claims 1 and 23 that attributes are "directly related" to visual rendering, and modality dependent attributes being provided "directly" from the controls on the authoring page, are vague and indefinite. It is appreciated that Applicants are attempting to distinguish by inclusion of the term "directly related" over the modality independent script of *Dantzig et al.* However, Applicants' Specification does not expressly disclose anything about the attributes being "directly related" to the visual rendering or using modality dependent attributes provided "directly" from the controls on an authoring page, nor would it be immediately clear to one having ordinary skill in the art that the attributes are "directly related" in any sense not necessarily disclosed by *Dantzig et al.* The limitation "directly related" is vague, and may be misdescriptive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 to 2 and 4 to 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Dantzig et al.*

Regarding independent claim 1, *Dantzig et al.* discloses a system and method for generating multi-modal applications from markup scripts, comprising:

“a set of modality dependent controls defined in an authoring page for a website for defining desired visual renderings and at least one of recognition and audible prompting on a client in a client/server system, each control having a first set of attributes directed related to visual rendering and a second set of attributes directed related to at least one of recognition and audibly prompting, the controls being related to client side markup executable by a client browser” – an XML (eXtensible Markup Language) script is implemented in a single authoring format (“an authoring page”) (column 5, lines 50 to 56); main renderer 14 of a multi-modal presentation manager 11 initiates a first processing thread comprising a GUI presentation manager 15 (“a first set of attributes directly related to visual rendering”) (column 7, lines 38 to 43: Figure 1);

presentation of a graphic user interface (GUI) for an application defines a “desired visual rendering”; main renderer 14 of a multi-modal presentation manager 11 initiates a second processing thread comprising a speech renderer 16 (“a second set of attributes directly related to at least one of recognition and audibly prompting”), wherein the speech renderer 16 utilizes a plurality of speech engines 17 for speech recognition and text-to-speech synthesis (column 7, lines 38 to 47: Figure 1); controls are “modality dependent” because each processing thread is directed to either a modality relating to GUI presentation or a modality relating to a speech renderer; multi-modal presentation manager 11 controls an application on a web browser or a desktop (column 8, lines 32 to 35: Figure 1); one thread comprising a GUI presentation manager 15 is “directly related” to defining desired visual renderings on the client device because the thread immediately initiates a visual modality; similarly, a second thread comprising a speech renderer 16 is “directly related” to defining desired operation on the client device because the thread immediately initiates speech recognition or text-to-speech synthesis;

“a module operable on a computer, the module being configured to receive the authoring page, and wherein the module is further configured to generate, using modality dependent attributes provided directly from controls on the authoring page, client side markup executable by the client browser on the client in the server/client system in accordance with the controls and the attributes of the controls to perform both visual rendering and at least one of recognition and audibly prompting” – multi-modal presentation manager 11 controls an application on a web browser or a desktop

(column 8, lines 32 to 35: Figure 1); implicitly, a web browser is executed on a client in a client/server architecture for receiving information from the Internet; a “single-authoring” system and method is an interaction-based programming paradigm for creating content as an intent-based markup script (column 5, line 20 to column 6, line 2; column 10, lines 24 to 28); thus, authoring for web-based presentation is on “an authoring page” at a client browser; main renderer 14 of a multi-modal presentation manager 11 initiates a first processing thread comprising a GUI presentation manager 15 (“a first set of attributes directly related to visual rendering”) (column 7, lines 38 to 43: Figure 1); presentation of a graphic user interface (GUI) for an application defines a “desired visual rendering”; main renderer 14 of a multi-modal presentation manager 11 initiates a second processing thread comprising a speech renderer 16 (“a second set of attributes directly related to at least one of recognition and audibly prompting”), wherein the speech renderer 16 utilizes a plurality of speech engines 17 for speech recognition and text-to-speech synthesis (column 7, lines 38 to 47: Figure 1).

Regarding claims 2 and 4, *Dantzig et al.* discloses that controls relate to grammars for speech recognition (column 9, lines 31 to 39; column 16, lines 6 to 30).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, *Dantzig et al.* discloses that controls relate to XML (column 5, lines 50 to 56), VoiceXML (a form of XML) (Abstract), and WML (column 6, lines 56 to 62).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, *Dantzig et al.* discloses a speech renderer 16 generates audible output by text-to-speech synthesis (column 7, lines 42 to 45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 9 to 11, and 23 to 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dantzig et al.* in view of *Ladd et al.* ('336).

Concerning independent claim 23, *Dantzig et al.* discloses a system and method for generating multi-modal applications from markup scripts, comprising:

“a first set of modality dependent visual controls having attributes defined on an authoring page for a website directly having attributes directly related to defining desired visual renderings on the client device, the first set of controls being related to client side markup executable by a client browser” – main renderer 14 of a multi-modal presentation manager 11 initiates a first processing thread comprising a GUI presentation manager 15; controls are “modality dependent” because each processing thread is directed to either a modality relating to GUI presentation or a modality relating to a speech renderer (“a first set of modality dependent visual controls having attributes . . . related to defining desired visual renderings”) (column 7, lines 38 to 43: Figure 1); an XML (eXtensible Markup Language) script is implemented in a single authoring format (“defined on an authoring page for a website”) (column 5, lines 50 to 56); presentation of a graphic user interface (GUI) for an application defines a “desired

visual rendering”; multi-modal presentation manager 11 controls an application on a web browser or a desktop (column 8, lines 32 to 35: Figure 1); implicitly, a web browser is executed on a client in a client/server architecture for receiving information from the Internet;

“a second set of modality dependent controls defined on the authoring page for operation on the client device having attributes directly related to at least one of recognition and audible prompting, . . . the second set of controls being selectively associated with the first controls, and the second set of controls being related to client side markup executable a client browser” – main renderer 14 of a multi-modal presentation manager 11 initiates a second processing thread comprising a speech renderer 16, wherein the speech renderer 16 utilizes a plurality of speech engines 17 for speech recognition and text-to-speech synthesis (column 7, lines 38 to 47: Figure 1); controls are “modality dependent” because each processing thread is directed to either a modality relating to GUI presentation or a modality relating to a speech renderer (“a second set of modality dependent controls having attributes directly related to at least one of recognition and audible prompting”) (column 7, lines 38 to 43: Figure 1); an XML (eXtensible Markup Language) script is implemented in a single authoring format (“defined on an authoring page for a website”) (column 5, lines 50 to 56); multi-modal presentation manager 11 controls an application on a web browser or a desktop (column 8, lines 32 to 35: Figure 1); implicitly, a web browser is executed on a client in a client/server architecture for receiving information from the Internet; in deferred rendering and presentation, a speech renderer 16 (“a second set of controls”) is

“selectively associated with” GUI presentation manager 15 (“a first set of controls”) because multi-modal presentation manager 11 automatically integrates and synchronizes voice synthesis and speech recognition functions with the presentation layer of applications (column 6, line 63 to column 7, line 8: Figure 1);

“a module operable on a computer, the module being configured to receive the authoring page, wherein the module is further configured to process the controls of the first set in the authoring page to generate client side markup by incorporating the attributes in the modality dependent controls that is executable by the client browser on the client in the server/client system in accordance with the controls of the first set and the attributes of the controls of the first set to perform both visual rendering, and wherein the module is configured to process the controls of the second set to generate client side markup by incorporating the attributes in the modality dependent controls that is executable by the client browser on the client in the client/server system in accordance with the controls of the second set and the attributes of the controls of the second set in the authoring page to perform at least one of recognition and audibly prompting” – main renderer 14 of a multi-modal presentation manager 11 initiates a second processing thread comprising a speech renderer 16, wherein the speech renderer 16 utilizes a plurality of speech engines 17 for speech recognition and text-to-speech synthesis (column 7, lines 38 to 47: Figure 1); controls are “modality dependent” because each processing thread is directed to either a modality relating to GUI presentation or a modality relating to a speech renderer (“a second set of modality dependent controls”) (column 7, lines 38 to 43: Figure 1); an XML (eXtensible Markup

Language) script is implemented in a single authoring format ("the authoring page") (column 5, lines 50 to 56); authoring produces content for both GUI presentation manager 15 and speech renderer 16 (column 7, lines 38 to 48).

Concerning independent claim 23, *Dantzig et al.* discloses grammars in VoiceXML in order to optimize speech recognition functions (column 10, lines 38 to 56), but omits the limitations of "wherein attributes directly related to recognition include at least one of location of grammar for use in recognition and confidence level thresholds for recognition and wherein attributes directed related to audible prompting include at least one of inline text for text-to-speech conversion, location of data for audible rendering and playing of a prerecorded audio file". However, *Ladd et al.* ('336) teaches a voice browser for interactive services, where a GRAMMAR input includes a SCR attribute that can be a grammar address (*i.e.*, a URL) for a markup language document: SCR = "gram//.SomeGrammar/month/year" ("location of a grammar for use in recognition"). (Column 20, Line 47 to Column 21, Line 1) Moreover, *Ladd et al.* ('336) provides a voice browser, where a PROMPT element of the markup language is used to define content by <PROMPT> text </PROMPT> that is read by a text-to-speech unit, so that markup of <PROMPT> Please select a soft drink. </PROMPT> includes at least "inline text for text-to-speech conversion". (Column 16, Line 63 to Column 17, Line 21; Column 18, Lines 33 to 39) An objective is permit users to access information from any location in the world via any suitable network access device. (Column 43, Lines 54 to 63) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include markup attributes relating to a location of a grammar and inline text for text-to-speech

conversion as taught by *Ladd et al.* ('336) in a system and method for generating and presenting multi-modal applications from markup scripts of *Dantzig et al.* for a purpose of permitting users to access information from any location in the world via a suitable network access device.

Concerning claims 3 and 25, *Ladd et al.* ('336) discloses attributes for grammars (column 13, lines 6 to 10), and retrieving grammars from database locations (column 12, lines 7 to 14; column 14, lines 18 to 28) for speech recognition.

Concerning claims 9 to 11, and 31 to 33, *Ladd et al.* ('336) discloses determining an address for playing a prompt to a user (column 13, line 66 to column 14, line 17: Figure 5a: Steps 400, 402, 406); both recorded sound samples (column 15, line 63) and text to speech (TTS) (column 16, lines 11 to 20) are provided.

Concerning claims 24 and 26, *Dantzig et al.* discloses controls relate to grammars for speech recognition (column 9, lines 31 to 39; column 16, lines 6 to 30).

Concerning claims 27 and 28, *Dantzig et al.* discloses controls relating to XML (column 5, lines 50 to 56), VoiceXML (a form of XML) (Abstract), and WML (column 6, lines 56 to 62).

Concerning claims 29 and 30, *Dantzig et al.* discloses a speech renderer 16 generates audible output by text-to-speech synthesis (column 7, lines 42 to 45).

Concerning claims 34 to 46, *Dantzig et al.* discloses a system and method for generating and presenting multi-modal applications from markup scripts for synchronizing a GUI presentation layer with voice synthesis and speech recognition, but

omits details relating to “attributes providing a reference to a location”, “a prerecorded audio data file”, “an identifier of the associated control”, “a question control”, “an answer control”, “binding the recognition value”, and “a confirmation control”. However, *Ladd et al.* (‘336) teaches a voice browser for interactive services. An objective is permit users to access information from any location in the world via any suitable network access device. (Column 43, Lines 54 to 63) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include details disclosed by *Ladd et al.* (‘336) in a system and method for generating and presenting multi-modal applications from markup scripts of *Dantzig et al.* for a purpose of permitting users to access information from any location in the world via a suitable network access device.

Concerning claim 34, *Ladd et al.* (‘336) discloses a markup language for text to speech; implicitly, when the text is displayed and the speech is produced for an audible prompt, there is an association of attributes between visual controls and audible controls.

Concerning claims 35 to 37, *Ladd et al.* (‘336) discloses an option list in a markup language for controlling which choices are available at a network access apparatus (column 28, lines 9 to 60).

Concerning claim 38, *Ladd et al.* (‘336) discloses a FORM input to collect an order in response to a prompt, and post the input to an address (column 20, lines 20 to 46); thus, a markup language controls a prompt, then activates an input, and then performs a post operation.

Concerning claims 39 to 43, *Ladd et al.* ('336) discloses a markup language for generating an audible prompt of a question and a grammar for an answer; an answer is followed by, and is activated, a question prompt, where an answer is bound for recognition by <INPUT TYPE> (column 18, lines 40 to 55); a post operation is "an event related to operation of binding" (column 20, lines 28 to 46).

Concerning claims 44 to 46, *Ladd et al.* ('336) discloses a markup language for re-prompting ("repeating an audible prompt") (column 14, line 57 to column 15, line 16: Figure 5a: Steps 416, 425), and an attribute for confirming a recognition result (column 15, lines 45 to 54: Figure 5a: Step 452).

Claims 47 to 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dantzig et al.* in view of *Ladd et al.* ('336) as applied to claims 23, 39, 40, 45, and 46 above, and further in view of *WCW Working Draft* ("*Grammar Representation Requirements for Voice Markup Languages*").

Ladd et al. ('336) discloses a confirmation control to accept an answer as a recognized result that is correct (column 15, lines 44 to 59: Figure 5b: Step 456). Lack of confirmation implicitly denies a recognized result, whereupon the process continues to replay a prompt for a current step so as to correct a recognition result. (Figures 5a and 5b: Step 446) However, *Ladd et al.* ('336) omits an attribute related to a confidence level for confirming, accepting or denying, and correcting a recognition result. *WCW Working Draft* teaches grammars for voice markup languages with attributes, where confidence scoring tightens or relaxes the normal rejection constraints to provide

content based control of performance. (Sections 4.3 and 5.1) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide confidence scoring as taught by *WCW Working Draft* in the voice browser for interactive services of *Ladd et al.* ('336) for a purpose of tightening or relaxing rejection constraints to provide content based control of performance.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed 16 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Firstly, Applicants argue that the limitation of "directly related" is not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd ¶. Applicants say that controls for visual display such as location for rendering, font, foreground color, background color, *etc.*, are expressly recited so as to remove any doubt as to what directly related means.

However, it is respectfully maintained that reciting examples of the controls does not make the term "directly related" any more definite. It is the nature of the relationship alleged to be "direct" that gives rise to the indefiniteness, not the nature of the controls. Again, it is recognized that Applicants are attempting to distinguish over *Dantzig et al.*, the prior art, by including the limitation of "directly related" as basis for patentability. However, the limitation of "directly related" is itself indefinite, because it is not clear in what sense the relationship is "direct", or how a similar relationship in any prior art might be correspondingly "indirect".

Secondly, Applicants argue that *Dantzig et al.* does not in any way define the term “directly related” so as to cast doubt as to the definiteness of the limitation “directly related”. Applicants say that they have provided evidence that the Specification provides specific attributes that one skilled in the art would understand are "directly related".

Here, it should be pointed out that there is no requirement of showing that the prior art renders a limitation indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd ¶. Clearly, an indefiniteness rejection does not rely upon prior art. Still, Applicants' position that the specific attributes that are "directly related" are disclosed by the Specification is disingenuous because Applicants' arguments are predicated on a distinction between attributes being modality-independent or modality-dependent so as to distinguish over *Dantzig et al.*, and not on any specific examples of attributes such as location for rendering, font, foreground color, background color, *etc.*

Thirdly, Applicants attempt to distinguish over *Dantzig et al.* by saying that the controls are “modality dependent”.

However, Applicants' limitations directed to controls that are "modality dependent" present issues of new matter as not being described by Applicants' originally-filed Specification. Applicants' Specification does not appear to expressly disclose the term “modality dependent”, and the only place that term is found is in *Dantzig et al.* It is improper under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st ¶, for Applicants to copy a term found only in the prior art, and to claim it as their invention, when the term is not adequately described by their originally-filed Specification.

Moreover, it is maintained that the individual threads are “modality dependent” for *Dantzig et al.* One thread comprises a GUI presentation manager and a second thread comprises a speech renderer. (Column 7, Lines 38 to 51) *Dantzig et al.* expressly refers to these as “modality-specific representations”. (Column 7, Lines 25 to 30)

Therefore, the rejections of claims 1 to 11 and 23 to 51 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st ¶, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; of claims 1 to 11 and 23 to 51 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd ¶, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter; of claims 1 to 2 and 4 to 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Dantzig et al.*; of claims 3, 9 to 11, and 23 to 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dantzig et al.* in view of *Ladd et al.* ('336); and of claims 47 to 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dantzig et al.* in view of *Ladd et al.* ('336), and further in view of *WCW Working Draft*, are proper.

Conclusion

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARTIN LERNER whose telephone number is (571)272-7608. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Art Unit: 2626

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Martin Lerner/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2626
July 30, 2008